AFS-600
Regulatory Support Division

DESIGNEE UPDATE

Vol. 12, No. 4 **A quarterly publication designed to serve the Examiner, Designee, and Instructor Community** **OCTOBER 2000**

INSIDE THIS UPDATE

SURFACE TENSION

We are under the impression that many pilots from all levels and backgrounds are being slowly turned off with the continuous discussion of runway incursion. Several pilot examiners have stated that every safety seminar, flight instructor refresher course, and pilot examiner standardization seminar they have attended are spent discussing runway incursion.

This might sound like a negative attitude at first until you realize that maybe the awareness goal is being reached. And if that is the case, maybe we can concentrate on doing something about the problem. The title, "Surface Tension," was used in lieu of "Runway Incursion" in an effort to draw you in. As much as we would like, we cannot accept the credit for this new title and fresh approach to the ongoing problem of runway incursion. In October 2000, FAA AVNEWS, will run a feature called "Surface Tension" by Phyllis Duncan. This article contains a fresh overview and suggestions you might not have considered up until now.

The article uses the phrase "defensive taxiing," a slick comparison to defensive driving. The article goes on to state that the old highway safety adage states an automobile accident is more likely to occur when you are within 25 miles of your house. Statistics show that aircraft accidents occur on takeoff/climbout or approach/landing. Taxiing to, onto, and from the runway may seem to be the safest portion of a flight operation; but, there have never been any formal procedures for getting from a parking spot or the gate to the runway, other than what ground control tells you to do or what habit indicates for a non-towered airport. With nationwide construction at the larger and busier airports, operating safely on an airport surface is becoming a challenge to the broad spectrum of pilots.

To alleviate this "surface tension," the FAA has developed some safe operating procedures which we feel will reduce exposure to hazard and overall risk during airport surface operations. This newsletter only has room to give you an abbreviated look at part 1 of a two-part article. Part 1 deals with operations at towered airports, and Part 2, in the next issue of FAA AVNEWS, will deal with non-towered airports. Of course, adding more procedures to the workload of pre-takeoff or pre-landing cockpit may seem a contradiction. Today it has become the norm for pilots to be programming flight management systems dealing with complicated air traffic control instructions, receiving data link messages, or talking to the company for last minute dispatch information.

Reducing runway incursions really comes down to three adequacies: planning, coordination, and

communication. All must be complete and thorough to insure that runway incursions do not become a common part of surface movement. The challenges of a cockpit crew of two or three versus a crew of one are different, and any safe operating procedures have to take that into consideration. (FAA AVNEWS)

WHAT IS A RUNWAY INCURSION?

An article from "Runway Incursion Corner" states, in order for an incident to be classified as a runway incursion, there must be a collision hazard or a loss of separation. According to FAA Order 7210.58, National Runway Safety Program, if an aircraft intending to land is sent around within one mile of the landing threshold due to an aircraft, vehicle, or pedestrian incurring on the runway, that is a runway incursion. If the aircraft has been cleared for takeoff and is rolling down the runway when the takeoff clearance is cancelled, that is a runway incursion. If takeoff roll has not commenced, it would be a surface incident.

THE NEW 8710-1(4-00)

We keep getting asked why the name, date of birth, and certificate number of the applicant are requested on the second page of the new application. Look on the lower part of the first page of instructions and you will find the answer. "If an electronic form is not printed on a duplex printer, the applicant's name, date of birth, and certificate number (if applicable) must be furnished on the reverse side of the second page in case the two pages become detached. This information is required for identification purposes. The telephone number and E-mail address are optional."

If you use an electronic form, it is required to have the same formatting, fonts, density. and size identical to the FAA form in current use. The form must not be altered in any way in the printing process. If the form is different in any way from the FAA form, it may be returned by AFS-760 for correction.

APPLICATION BY A "HOLDER OF FOREIGN LICENSE ISSUED BY"

The following is guidance concerning FAA FORM 8710-1 (4-00), Section II., Block D., "Holder of Foreign License Issued By".

The Airman Certification Branch (AFS-760) advises that Block D. is to be completed by the applicant whenever the foreign pilot license is the basis for the current application. Only Block D. must be completed for the original application for a "Restricted" U.S. Airman Certificate.

BOTH Block D.and Block A. must be completed when:
(1) Adding a "US TEST PASSED" rating to a "Restricted" U.S. Airman Certificate.
(2) The applicant is using the "Restricted" Private U.S. Airman Certificate when applying for an original "Unrestricted" Commercial pilot certificate per 14 CFR Section 61.123 [Ref 61.123(h)].
(3) The applicant is using his/her foreign pilot license to meet the eligibility requirement of 14 CFR Section 61.153 (d) [Ref:61.153(d)(3)] for an original Airline Transport Pilot certificate.

GULP!!!

A control tower at a foreign airfield cleared a U.S. Navy aircraft to taxi into position and hold on the runway. While waiting for release, the flightcrew was monitoring the field's approach and departure frequency on the aircraft's number two radio. Therefore, the flightcrew knew that an Air Force C-5 was maneuvering to land. The crew assumed the C-5 was going to circle to land behind the Navy aircraft based upon the wind condition and the fact the tower had taxied the Naval aircraft into position and hold.

When cleared for takeoff, an "Anonymous" reporter stated, "We reviewed our takeoff performance numbers and then began our near-fatal takeoff roll, ignoring the hard to miss C-5 in front of us." "At approximately 90 knots, with 5,500 feet of runway remaining, I watched the C-5, then 3 or 4 miles in front of us, continue its descent for landing. Realizing the imminent danger, I initiated an abort. Concurrently, the tower told us to abort takeoff. Also, the approach controller directed the C-5, now on short final, to "execute missed approach." After

the aborted takeoff, the Navy crew taxied back, regained their composure, and made a normal takeoff. The Air Force C-5 made a go-around and landed."

A later investigation discovered the approach-controller had cleared the C-5 to land on the same runway without tower authorization while that same approach-control had authorized the tower controller to clear the waiting Navy aircraft for takeoff on the same runway. According to the article, an Air Traffic Control review board found the approach-controller at fault and suspended him indefinitely.

The "Anonymous" Navy pilot, who submitted the lessons-learned article, said, in part, that although he felt justice had been served, he later felt silly because, "how could I have ever dreamt of taking the runway and starting a takeoff roll without clarifying with the tower that the C-5, a hard aircraft to miss, was in fact going to circle to land. This entire incident could have been avoided if I, or another flightcrew member, had insisted on clarifying the C-5's intentions. It would have only taken a second to query the tower controller before ever taking the runway. It was a tough, embarrassing lesson for everyone, especially me."

QUESTIONS FOR THE NEB

The National Examiner Board (NEB) receives many phone calls from examiner candidates with a wide range of questions regarding the status of their application. Questions regarding NEB business can be sent to the following e-mail address:

Barbara.A.Schnell@faa.gov

MORE THAN ONE PTS

During DPE recurrent training some examiners appear vague on procedures involving the addition of a type rating to a private or commercial pilot certificate. When adding a type rating, it is normal to think that we must use the Airline Transport Pilot and Aircraft Type Rating PTS. However, let's pursue the following scenario:

An applicant holds a commercial pilot airplane certificate with a single-engine land rating, and desires to add a Citation type rating. The first thing that must be realized is that the applicant does not hold a multiengine **class** rating, and since the ATP and Aircraft Type Rating PTS does not test the basic tasks for a multiengine class rating, both the ATP and Aircraft Type Rating PTS and the Commercial Pilot PTS must be used in combination. This must be accomplished when the applicant does not already hold the appropriate category and class rating.

To further complicate matters, if the applicant holds a limited commercial (no instrument), and adds a type rating, use of the current Instrument PTS would also be required. In unusual situations of this nature, and in the effort to reduce confusion, the importance of using a carefully-prepared **plan of action** becomes quite obvious.

We're not home free yet. Don't forget, the applicant is required to have passed the appropriate instrument rating knowledge test since the beginning of the 24th month before the practical test is taken, if the test is for the concurrent issuance of an instrument rating and an aircraft type rating. This would not be required if the applicant was taking the type rating test in an aircraft that was incapable of flying in instrument conditions. This is seldom the case.

Remember, if the aircraft is capable of instrument flight, a VFR type rating is not permitted.

The information just discussed is covered in FAA-S-8081-5C, ATP and Aircraft Type Rating PTS, change 1, dated 10/26/98

HOW MANY OF US ARE THERE?

A computer printout of the national airmen totals shows the following:

Pilots – 598,217 (total)
Flight Instructors – 78,182
Designated Pilot Examiners – 1200
Training Center Evaluators – 400

Student Pilots – 88,857
Recreational Pilots – 345
Private Pilots – 255,835
Commercial Pilots – 120,875
Airline Transport Pilot – 132,305